DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 918 UD 015 474

TITLE New York State Opportunity Programs, 1972-73. SEEK, HEOP, and EOP at Public and Private Post Secondary Institutions.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Records; Ancillary Services; *College Programs; Culturally Disadvantaged; Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Programs; *Equal Education; Federal Programs; Financial Support; Post Secondary Education; *Poverty Programs; Private Colleges; *Program Evaluation; School Holding Power; State Colleges; Student Enrollment
IDENTIFIERS Education Opportunity Program; EOP; HEOP; Higher Education Opportunity Program; New York; Search for Education Elevation Knowledge Program; SEEK

ABSTRACT

This report is considered to constitute the first attempt to present a comparative analysis on university level programs of educational opportunities. The following topics are included in the analysis: enrollment and retention, demographic characteristics, academic background, major subject area, supportive services, academic progress, student costs and financial aid, and expenditures. Cited among the findings are the following: that academic dismissal is the most important reason for leaving opportunity programs, followed by personal reasons; that given educational and economic disadvantages, educational opportunity program students remain in college at high rates as compared to the average retention rate for all students in the nation; and that opportunity programs serve as a major vehicle for minority group enrollment. Certain practices concerning degree requirements, financial aid, and definitions for defining economic disadvantage are said to lack consistency across the programs. Stated in the recommendations are the need for comprehensive supportive services and the need for timely and accurate accounting of program activities and expenditures as the law provides. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111918

NEW YORK STATE

OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS, 1972-73

SEEK, HEOP, and EOP at Public and Private Postsecondary Institutions

UD 015474

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

THEODORE M. BLACK
CHANCELLOR

1878 NORTHERN BOULEVARD
ROSLYN, NEW YORK 11576

August 27, 1975

The Honorable Hugh L. Carey
Governor of New York
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

Dear Governor Carey:

Education Law, Section 6452, requires that each of the public universities submit an annual report describing the activities of their program of educational opportunity, and that the Regents "shall review such report and forward same, together with their comments and recommendations to the governor and the legislature..."

Annual reports for SEEK at the City University and EOP at the State University for the 1972-73 year were received quite late by the Department, some State University data not being received until well into 1975. Staff of the Department have prepared a mandated review of those documents, along with comments and recommendations, in the form of a tripartite report which presents data about the programs in the public universities alongside similar data about HEOP at the non-public colleges and universities for 1972-73. The Regents approved that review for transmittal at their regular June, 1975 meeting and it is hereby transmitted to you.

Sincerely,

Theodore M. Black

Theodore M. Black
Chancellor

Enclosures

cc: Legislative Leadership

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Summary	1
Enrollment and Retention	3
Demographic Characteristics	10
Academic Background	17
Major Subject Area	25
Supportive Services	25
Academic Progress	38
Student Costs and Financial Aid	42
Expenditures	50
Comments and Recommendations	53
Participating Institutions	55

TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	Projected and Actual Opportunity Enrollments, 1972-73	3
2	Opportunity Program Enrollments, 1972-73	4
3	Opportunity Program Enrollment, 1972-73	6
4	Opportunity Program Attendance, Change in Spring Enrollments From Fall Enrollments, 1972-73	7
5	Change in Enrollment of Opportunity Students Who Attended the Fall Semester, 1972, and Who Returned for the Spring Semester, 1973	8
6	Rank Order of Program Separation Conditions 1972-73; Total Program	9
7	Average Retention Rates for Opportunity Programs and National Averages, 1972-73	11
8	Percent Distribution of Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment by Ethnic Identity, Fall 1970 versus Fall 1972, all Campuses with Opportunity Programs	12
9	Summary of Minority Growth for Institutions Participating in Opportunity Programs	13
10	Changes in Racial/Ethnic Distribution, Total Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollments	14
11	Percent Distribution of Opportunity Program Students According to Race, 1972-73	15
12	Sex and Age Summary of Opportunity Students, 1972-73	16
13	Accumulative Distribution of Gross Family Incomes of Opportunity Students, 1972-73	18
14	Distribution of Opportunity Students by Number in Household, Married, and Benefits Received, 1972-73	19
15	Summary Table for Entering Freshmen, 1972-73	20
16	Percentile Distribution of RSE Scores, 1971 Series for High School Seniors Entering College, Fall, 1972	22
17	Accumulative Distribution of RSE Scores for EOP Students, 1972-73	23
18	Distribution of SAT Scores, 1972-73	24

TABLES (Cont.)

Table	Title	Page
19	Accumulative Distribution of Combined SAT Scores for Opportunity Students, 1972-73	26
20	Major Subject Area of Study for Opportunity Students Enrolled in Two-Year Degree Programs, 1972-73	27
21	Rank Order of Major Areas of Study for Upper Division Students in Four or Five-Year Bachelor Degree Programs, 1972-73	28
22	Distribution of Tutoring Services to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	30
23	Distribution of Tutoring Services to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	31
24	Counseling Services to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	32
25	Rank Order of Counseling Contacts by Purpose in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73	34
26	Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses Utilized by Opportunity Students, 1972-1973	35
27	Percent Distribution of Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses Utilized by Opportunity Students, 1972-1973	36
28	Completion Rates, Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses, 1972-73	36
29	Summary, Supportive Services Available to Opportunity Students in 1972-1973	37
30	Accumulative GPA's for Opportunity Students in Attendance, 1972-73	39
31	Average Credits Accumulated by Number of Semesters in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73	40
32	Distribution of Opportunity Students by Total Hours Accumulated by 1972-73	41
33	Average Costs Compared to Average Aid Available to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	43
34	Percent Distribution of Budgeted College-Going Costs for Opportunity Students, 1972-73	45
35	Distribution of Budgeted College-Going Costs for Opportunity Students, 1972-73	45
36	Financial Aid Grants to Opportunity Students Compared to Budgeted Costs, 1972-73	46

TABLES (Cont.)

Table	Title	Page
37	Distribution of Average Aid per Student in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73	47
38	Percent Distribution of Financial Aid to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	48
39	Percent Distribution of Financial Aid to Opportunity Students, 1972-73	50
40	Professional Personnel Caseload of Opportunity Students and Average Supportive Services Expenditures per Student, 1973	51
41	Total Opportunity Program Expenditures Per Student: Supportive Service Costs plus Tuition, Fees and Books plus Living Costs (from all sources)	52

A Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Opportunity Programs in the State of New York 1972-73

In 1966, a state program was instituted to advance the cause of equality of educational opportunity in the City University of New York (CUNY). This program came to be known as Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK) with a similar program (EOP) extended later to some units of the State University of New York (SUNY). In 1969, a comparable program was initiated at private colleges and universities under the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP).

Sections 6451 and 6452 of the education law, as added by chapter 1077 of the laws of 1969, which established the HEOP program, provided for a statewide coordination of these opportunity programs at CUNY, SUNY, and the private colleges and universities under the aegis of the Board of Regents. $5 million was appropriated initially for implementing its provisions. Appropriations have grown over the years and for 1972-73 totalled over $32 million.

Section 6452, Par. 5.a., directs that "the trustees of the State University and Board of Higher Education in the City of New York shall each furnish to the Regents, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, at least annually, a report . . .of the operations of such EOP and SEEK programs."

Section 6452, Par. 5.b., goes on to state that "The Regents shall review such reports and forward the same, along with their comments and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. . ."

This document accompanies those reports, and includes the "comments and recommendations" mandated. Additionally, an effort has been made to display and compare data from the three sectors (HEOP, EOP, and SEEK) where there are State-supported systems of postsecondary education for the disadvantaged. This constitutes the first attempt to display opportunity program data on a comparative basis. (College Discovery, at the two-year colleges in the City of New York, had not joined the reporting system which generated this document in 1972-73. Future reports will include data from College Discovery as well.)

SUMMARY

Findings

1. For 1972-73, the Legislature approved funds for 23,600 opportunity students. Actual enrollments were 23,565 (page 3).

2. In 1972-73, academic dismissal was the most important reason that students left opportunity programs; personal reasons were second in importance (page 9).

3. Compared to the average retention rate for all students in the nation, opportunity program students remained in college at a remarkably high rate, especially so considering their educational and economic disadvantages (page 11).

4. Opportunity programs served as a major vehicle for minority group enrollments in 1972-73. Minority group members made up between 55% and 92% of opportunity program enrollments in 1972-73. In comparison, only 13.6% of all undergraduates were members of minority groups (page 12).

5. A majority of students in opportunity programs in 1972-73 were women (page 12).

6. Over 90% of all opportunity program students came from families with incomes below $10,000. Their average Scholastic Aptitude Test scores were 495 (verbal) and 460 (math) (pages 17 - 25).

7. Supportive services were used extensively. Forty percent of opportunity program students received tutoring; 80% received special counseling (pages 29 - 33).

8. Generally, students in four year opportunity programs in 1972-73 accumulated credits at a rate permitting graduation after 8 to

10 semesters (page 40).

9. Costs of attending college exceeded available financial aid for opportunity program students in 1972-73 by up to $1,329. The difference was made up by both work and loans (pages 42-46).

10. A list of all institutions with opportunity programs appears as Appendix A.

Comments (pages 53 - 54)

1. In all sectors, opportunity programs accounted for a small percentage (from four to ten percent) of the total student enrollment. However, they did amount to a large percentage (40% to 60%) of the non-white enrollment at participating institutions, indicating their value as a vehicle to enhance the goal of equality of educational opportunity. Any diminution in the opportunity student enrollment would affect the total number of minority students already on campus.

2. It is interesting to note that the highest ranking job placement for opportunity students was in the field of education. This is particularly significant in light of the tightening of the job market in that field but appears to indicate that minority group members are in demand in this profession. The influx of opportunity program students has helped to diversify and enrich the education profession itself.

3. About 25% of opportunity program students who graduated in 1972-73 went into graduate and professional schools. It is an interesting American phenomenon that such large numbers of first-generation college graduates pursued further professional or graduate education. This development could be attributed to the high level of aspiration, confidence,

achievement and sophistication on the part of those students and those who counselled them.

4. Certain practices lack consistency as examined across the three sectors. It is to be hoped that in the continuing evaluation of these programs, the "coordinated policy" envisioned by the legislation emerges. For example:

(a) While the sectors have now agreed on a common income scale for defining economic "disadvantage," a clear understanding of educational "disadvantage" is still lacking. For instance, 61% of EOP admits at University Centers had RSE scores below 100, while only 13% of EOP admits at the SUNY specialized units fall in this category.

(b) While HEOP and EOP both assume a limited number of semesters of eligibility to achieve a degree goal, such as ten semesters for a normal four-year baccalaureate, SEEK imposes no such expectation. Thus at the end of eight full semesters, the average SEEK student had completed 81 credits, the average EOP/HEOP student 106.

(c) A rational State policy of financial aid for students in opportunity programs clearly does not exist. The students are the same in their sociological, educational and economic circumstances. As such they have similar needs in terms of availability for work during term time, and limits in term of family resources and ability to take on high loans. Yet the match between need and aid varies from program to program, all the way from no unmet need at the upstate community colleges to a $950 shortfall at SEEK and above $1,300 at the private two-year colleges.

Recommendations (page 54)

1. The public sector central administrations should take care to devote the resources necessary for the timely and accurate accounting of program activities and expenditures, as the law provides. Only thus can the coordination and improvement of program practices for the disadvantaged in higher education be fully accomplished.

2. The poor performance of EOP students at community colleges can be directly traced to lack of comprehensive supportive services. Every effort must be made to remedy this situation.

Opportunity Program Enrollment Histories and Retention Rates, 1972-1973

The State Legislature approved funds for the enrollment of 23,600 opportunity students in 1972-73. The actual enrollment for the year averaged 23,565.5, less than one percent under the expected (Table 1). The SEEK program was overenrolled by 479 students, while EOP was underenrolled by 631, and HEOP by 80.

Table 1

Projected and Actual Opportunity Program Enrollments, 1972-73

	Projected Enrollment	Actual Enrollment	Difference	Percent Difference
SEEK	8,500	8,979	+479	+ 5.6%
HEOP	5,300	5,220	- 80	- 1.5%
EOP	9,860	9,228.5	- 631.5	- 6.4%
Totals	23,660	23,427.5	-232.5	- .99%

Enrollment projections are difficult to meet exactly. Underenrollment for the year usually represents first-semester attrition not made up by second-semester entrants. Because of its contractual arrangement, HEOP, unlike SEEK and EOP, cannot overenroll in anticipation of attrition.

Student enrollments were reported according to four possible sessions of attendance (Table 2). HEOP had the greatest percentage of student participation during the summer; winter sessions, generally, were part of a

Table 2

Opportunity Program Enrollments, 1972-73

	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer Attendance as Percent of Fall Enrollment-Summer%	Winter Attendance as Percent of Spring Enrollment-Winter%
SEEK	NA	8,915	NA	9,043	NA	NA
HEOP:						
Four Year	1,184	3,902	303	3,770	30.3%	8.0%
Two Year	197	222	217	341	88.7%	63.6%
Part-Time	254	1,110	39	1,371	22.9%	2.8%
EOP:						
University Centers	145	2,843	0	2,896	5.1%	0.0%
University Colleges	429	3,309	206	3,211	13.0%	6.4%
Special Units	21	605	53	531	3.5%	10.0%
Ag & Techs.	4	161	0	131	2.5%	0.0%
Community Colleges	298	2,480	126	2,290	12.0%	5.5%
TOTALS	2,533	23,547	944	23,584	11.1%	4.1%

trimester or quarter arrangement. Overall, more than 11% of the opportunity students attended the summer session, while fewer than 5% the winter.

There is little or no provision for summer work for EOP/SEEK students. HEOP residential campuses normally run pre-freshman summer programs. Many upperclass students in all sectors attend summer sessions with little or no program support.

More than 80% of all opportunity students were enrolled in four (or five) year, full-time baccalaureate programs (Table 3).

Although there was an overall increase of 37 students between the fall and spring enrollments, five of the nine groups listed in Table 4 showed decreases ranging from 3.0% to 18.6%. The fall to spring net gain resulted despite the fact that about 14% of those students who attended the fall semester did not return in the spring (Table 5). More than half (56.4%) of these students transferred or graduated, while the rest attrited. Thus, heavy spring term admissions, especially at the City University, were used to keep up the overall enrollment average.

The reasons for separation of students from the program are ranked in Table 6. Even though academic dismissal was the primary cause of separation, transferred and academic leave cannot be construed to mean "attrition," since transferring implies continuing the educational process, while voluntary leaves of absence can be terminated at any time by re-enrollment.

Table 3

Opportunity Program Enrollment, 1972-73

	Four-year, full-time		Other		Total
SEEK		8,979	--		8,979
HEOP		3,836	Two-year: Part-time:	281.5 1,240.5[1]	5,358
EOP	University Centers:	2,869.5	Ags & Techs:	568	
	University Colleges	3,260	Community Colleges	2,385	
	Special Units	146			9,228.5
TOTALS		19,090.5		4,475	23,565.5

1. Average headcounts only. Table 1 is full-time equivalents.

Table 4

Opportunity Program Attendance

Change in Spring Enrollments
From Fall Enrollments, 1972-73

Sector	Difference in Enrollments	Percent Change
SEEK	+128	+1.4%
HEOP:		
Four Year	-132	-3.4%
Two Year	+119	+53.6%
Part-Time	+261	+23.5%
EOP:		
University Centers	+53	+1.9%
University Colleges	-98	-3.0%
Special Units	-74	-12.2%
Ag. & Techs.	-30	-18.6%
Community Colleges	-190	-7.7%
TOTALS	+37	+0.2%

Table 5

Change in Enrollment of Opportunity Students Who Attended the Fall Semester, 1972, and Who Returned for the Spring Semester, 1973

SECTOR	FALL ENROLLEES	RETURNED FOR SPRING	CHANGE IN NO. STS.	% CHANGE	GRADS. 72-73	OUT TRANS. 72-73	TOTAL GRADS & TRANS.
SEEK	8,915	7,832	-1,083	-12.1%	unspecified	NA	NA
HEOP:							
Four-Yr.	3,902	3,506	- 396	-10.1	630	69	699
Two-Yr.	222	186	- 36	-16.2	77	1	78
Part-Time	1,110	859	- 251	-22.6	27	52	79
EOP:							
Univ. Centers	2,843	2,616	- 227	- 8.0	234	16	250
Four-Yr. Colleges	3,309	2,819	- 490	-14.8	299	112	411
Special Colleges	161	131	- 30	-18.6	10	1	11
Ag & Tech	605	462	- 143	-23.6	101	3	104
Community Colleges	2,480	1,907	- 573	-23.1	140	52	192
TOTALS	23,547	20,318	-3,229	-13.7%	1,518	306	1,824

Table 6

Rank Order of Program Separation Conditions 1972-73; Total Program

Sector	Academic Leave	Academic Dismissal	Financial	Personal	Medical	Transfer	Other
SEEK	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
HEOP:							
Four Year	4	1	7	3	6	5	2
Two-Year	3.5	1.5	5	1.5	3.5	6	7
Part-Time	3	7	6	1	5	4	2
EOP:							
University Centers	6	1	5	3	4	7	2
University Colleges	3	1	5	2	6.5	4	6.5
Special Units	6	2	3	6	6	4	1
Ag & Techs	3	1	5	2	4	6.5	6.5
Community Colleges	4	2	6	1	7	5	3
Average Ranking	3	1	6	2	7	5	4

There is no one standard definition of "retention" or "attrition" for college students. The data in Table 7 are displayed according to the four most commonly used indices. Measured by any of these standards, program student performance is remarkable, in light of the fact of the severe academic disadvantages with which such students enter college.

The persistence rates for HEOP two-year and part-time programs and EOP special units do not provide reliable data. The internal differences among institutions, the small samples and/or the short histories of the individual programs do not provide an adequate data base. SUNY did not report on numbers of part-time EOP students. SEEK claims no part-time students are enrolled. Of the other programs, HEOP students had the best persistence across the four definitions, so that their persistence was better than the national average[1] on the first three measures (Table 7).

The total number of graduates among opportunity students had reached 3,713 by the summer of 1973.

Demographic Characteristics of Opportunity Students, 1972-73

Between fall 1970 and fall 1972 the racial characteristics of full-time undergraduate enrollments throughout the State changed, reflecting increased numbers of minorities (Table 8). The largest gains were in the categories of black and Spanish-surnamed, while "Others" decreased.

---

1. American Council on Education data.

Table 7

Average Retention Rates for Opportunity Programs and National Averages, 1972-73

Definitions	1	2	3	4
	Four-Year Colleges and University Centers			
National Average	78	47	58.5	81
SEEK	75	20	58	NA
HEOP	89	58	68	71.5
EOP Univ. Centers	71	29	59	63
EOP Univ. Colleges	76	38	52	76

	1	2	3	4
	Two-Yr. Programs & Colleges			
National Average	66	38	40.5	66
HEOP Two-Yr. Progs.	86	85	97	98
EOP Comm. Colls.	54	16	41	44
EOP Ag. & Techs.	66	42	70	92

	1	2	3	4
	Part-Time and Special Units			
HEOP Part-Time	55.5	8.0	20	35
EOP Special Units	56	43	54	77

Definitions:
1. Returned for a third academic semester.
2. Received a degree,
3. Received a degree or returned for the ninth semester of a baccalaureate program or the fifth semester for an associate program.
4. Received a degree, returned or transferred.

Table 8

Percent Distribution of Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment by Ethnic Identity, Fall 1970 versus Fall 1972, all Campuses with Opportunity Programs

	Native American	Black/ Negro	Oriental	Spanish-Surnamed	Others
1970	0.3%	5.9%	1.1%	2.2%	90.5%
1972	0.3	8.6	1.2	3.5	86.4
% Change	0.0%	+2.7%	+0.1%	+1.3%	-4.1%

Between 1968 and 1972 the most important enrollment increases occurred among black and Spanish-surnamed students, especially at the City University (Table 9). Relative decreases in white (Others) enrollments were evident across the whole State, especially within City- and State-operated institutions (Table 10).

Opportunity Programs have favored the ethnic minorities in terms of the thrust of their enrollments. The percent of opportunity students belonging to a minority group ranged from 55.0% at the community colleges to 92.2% at SEEK (Table 11).

Opportunity students tended to be older (over 21 years of age); a majority were female (Table 12). HEOP two-year and part-time programs and EOP community college programs had high percentages of students over 25 years of age. The press of student numbers and limited resources avail-

Table 9

Summary of Minority Growth for Institutions Participating in Opportunity Programs

	Native American	Black	Oriental	Spanish-Surnamed	Sub-Total	Other[1]	Total	Proportional Increase[2]
CUNY 1968-72	+149.8%	+521.6%	+112.9%	+617.7%	+423.0%	+36.7%	+67.3%	6.3
Private 1968-72	- 0.3	+124.8	-19.7	+47.9	+61.4	+7.4	+10.7	5.7
SUNY State Operated Colls. 1969-72	+199.3	+118.8	+192.9	+129.2	+127.2	+16.6	+21.2	6.0
SUNY Community Colleges 1969-72	+276.3	+102.9	+90.8	+77.2	+99.9	+21.8	+25.4	3.9
CUNY 1971-72	+2.9%	+18.3	-24.2	+61.4	+19.6	-1.7	+3.6%	5.4
Private 70-72	-20.2	+22.5	+30.7	+5.4	+17.5	-2.9	-1.4	13.5
SUNY State Oper. Colleges 1971-72	+33.6	+13.2	+34.0	+10.2	+14.7	+0.8	+1.7	8.6
SUNY Community Colleges 1971-72	+49.0	+33.3	-13.8	-2.4	+23.0	+2.4	+3.6	6.4

1. I.e., non-minority students.

2. Proportional increase of minorities to the increase of total enrollment; e.g., between 1968 and 1972, minorities at CUNY increased at a rate 6.3 times faster than the overall rate of increase.

Table 10

Changes in Racial/Ethnic Distribution, Total Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollments

CITY UNIVERSITY

	Native Amer.	Black/ Negro	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Subtotal Minorities	Others
1968	0.2%	3.9%	2.2%	1.7%	7.9%	92.1%
1972	0.3	14.5	2.8	7.2	24.8	75.2
Change '68-'72	+0.1	+10.6	+0.6	+5.5	+16.9	-16.9

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

	Native Amer.	Black/ Negro	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Subtotal Minorities	Others
1968	0.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.4%	6.2%	93.8%
1972	0.3	5.6	1.2	1.8	8.9	91.1
Change '68-'72	0.0	+2.8	-0.5	+0.4	+2.7	-2.7

STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

	Native Amer.	Black/ Negro	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Subtotal Minorities	Others
1969	0.1%	2.5%	0.3%	0.5%	3.4%	96.6%
1972	0.3	5.0	0.7	1.1	7.1	92.9
Change '69-'72	+0.2	+2.5	+0.4	+0.6	+3.7	-3.7

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Native Amer.	Black/ Negro	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Subtotal Minorities	Others
1969	0.1%	3.6%	0.2%	1.2%	5.1%	94.9%
1972	0.1	5.0	0.3	1.8	7.3	92.7
Change '69-'70	0.0	+1.4	+0.1	-0.6	+2.2	-2.2

Table 11

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Program Students According to Race, 1972-73

	Black	Native American	Oriental	Spanish-Surnamed	Sub-Total	White	Any Other	Total
SEEK	61.3%	0.2%	1.0%	29.7%	92.2%	7.8%	--	100.0%
HEOP:								
Four-Year	62.1	0.3	1.6	23.8	87.8	12.2	--	100.0
Two-Year	17.7	37.4	0.0	0.7	55.8	44.2	--	100.0
Part-Time	76.7	1.9	0.6	7.8	87.0	12.5	0.5	100.0
EOP:								
University Centers	68.4	0.5	1.2	17.8	87.9	11.0	1.1	100.0
University Colleges	66.7	1.8	0.5	9.9	78.9	20.3	0.8	100.0
Special Units	52.1	1.7	3.4	15.1	72.3	26.9	0.8	100.0
Ag & Techs	57.6	1.2	0.5	7.6	66.9	33.1	0.0	100.0
Community Colleges	50.5%	0.4	0.2	3.9	55.0	31.3	13.7	100.0

Table 12

Sex and Age Summary of Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	% Under 21	% 21-25	% Above 25	% Male	% Female
SEEK	42.1	44.8	13.1	44.5	55.5
HEOP:					
Four Year	63.9	24.9	11.2	48.6	51.4
Two-Year	46.9	20.4	32.7	28.5	71.5
Part-Time	12.1	24.8	63.1	41.5	58.5
EOP:					
University Centers	42.3	41.8	16.0	49.1	50.9
University Colleges	48.2	35.6	16.3	46.2	53.8
Special Units	57.1	36.6	9.2	64.7	35.3
Ag & Tech	64.9	20.1	15.0	40.4	59.6
Community Colleges	45.3	28.3	26.4	43.8	56.2

able for this population -- the older, often part-time (by necessity) disadvantaged student -- presents a problem as yet unsolved. Most program resources continue to be allocated to the full-time student.

With the use of income scales to determine economic eligibility for these programs, over 90% of the opportunity students came from families with gross incomes of less than $10,000 (Table 13). Many students were independent, with virtually no income while attending college (Table 14). The percentage of students that came from households of over four members ranged from 17% to 48%. HEOP part-time programs enrolled the largest percent of independent students and those from mid-sized families. Students who came from large families were in greatest number at HEOP two-year and EOP special units.

By far the greatest percent of married students were at HEOP two-year and part-time programs and the community colleges.

A small percentage of students received Veterans Benefits and Social Security funds while two to four times as many received Social Services assistance (Table 14). Recent figures indicate dramatic rises in these categories in 1973-74 and 1974-75.

Academic Background

Opportunity students have had, by definition, a poor academic preparation for a successful college career; in fact, between 16% and 60% of the entrants did not have academic high school diplomas (Table 15). Between 66% and 90% of those admitted to the programs had high school averages under 80%, many ranking in the lower three quintiles of their graduating classes.

Table 13

Accumulative Distribution of Gross Family Incomes
of Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	4,000	6,000	8,000	10,000	12,000	14,000	14,000 over
SEEK	51.4	76.1	94.2	98.6	99.7	99.9	100.0
HEOP:							
Four Year	49.7	76.5	90.6	97.6	99.7	99.9	100.0
Two Year	47.0	64.4	82.5	93.9	95.9	95.9	100.0
Part-Time	38.9	70.4	85.7	94.0	99.8	99.8	100.0
EOP:							
Univer. Cntr.	47.3	66.6	82.9	92.1	95.9	98.3	100.0
Univ. Colls.	44.3	64.8	83.0	94.3	97.3	99.3	100.0
Special Units	47.8	58.7	87.0	89.2	93.5	100.0	
Ag & Techs	41.2	72.4	92.8	98.6	99.3	100.0	
Community Colleges	51.9	73.2	88.9	96.5	98.5	99.7	100.0

Table 14

Distribution of Opportunity Students by Number in Household, Married, and Benefits Received, 1972-73

Sector	Number of Members in Household			Percent Married	Percent of Students Receiving		
	One (Indep. Student)	2 to 4	5 and Over		V.A. Benefits	Social Services Funds	Social Security Funds
SEEK	15.1%	46.1%	38.8%	7.6%	4.4%	29.6%	9.0%
HEOP:							
Four Year	18.9	47.2	33.9	10.9	7.8	23.7	7.6
Two Year	20.8	32.9	46.3	40.3	7.4	15.4	5.4
Part-time	26.7	56.4	16.9	50.7	6.0	28.1	0.9
EOP:							
University Centers	22.1	43.1	34.8	10.6	1.8	2.9	3.7
University Colleges	24.2	38.9	36.9	12.6	4.3	18.2	4.3
Special Units	6.5	45.6	47.9	13.0	8.7	19.6	8.7
Ag & Techs.	15.4	39.4	45.2	1.9	2.4	14.4	8.9
Community Colleges	22.6	50.2	27.2	24.5	4.3	28.3	7.2

Table 15

Summary Table for Entering Freshmen, 1972-73:

1. Percent of Opportunity Students with Average Grade in High School below 80%.

2. Percent Opportunity Students in the Lower Three Quintiles of their Graduating High School Class; and

3. Percent Opportunity Students Who Graduated from High School with a Non-Academic Diploma.

	SEEK	HEOP		EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
		4-Yr.	2-Yr.	Univ. Cntrs.	Univ. Coll.	Special College	Ag. & Techs.	State Oper. Mean	Comm. College
1. Below 80 Average	89.5%	72.9	75.5	69.0	73.0	35.1	87.2	73.8	90.9
2. Lower 3 Quintiles	N.A.	66.7	79.7	61.3	68.5	36.8	77.0	67.3	81.0
3. Non-Academic Dip.	N.A.	20.6	62.1	33.5	31.8	16.2	53.5	36.4	59.8

The Community College opportunity programs had a high percentage of students in these "disadvantaged" categories, while the SUNY special units had the least of any group.

The mean Regents Scholarship Examination score for the prospective college-going population, in Fall 1972, was 138. The curve of these scores was positively skewed so that the median fell at 133, and the 66th percentile was a score of 160 (Table 16). Most opportunity students at the SUNY operated campuses and the community colleges had RSE scores under 160; in fact, more than half earned scores under 100 -- the 28th percentile (Table 17). The EOP special units were an exception; the majority of their students had scores above 160. RSE scores were not available for HEOP and SEEK populations; they were a requirement for entrance only at SUNY.

The mean SAT scores for New York State are displayed in Table 18. The average math and verbal scores were 495 and 460, respectively. A score of 560 marked the 81st percentile in mathematics and the 72nd percentile in verbal skills, which meant that 19% of the test-takers scored 560 and above on math, and 28% scored 560 and above on the verbal test.

The percent of opportunity students who scored above 560 ranged from 0.0 to 23% on the math and 0.0 to 17% on the verbal. HEOP two-year programs had no students in this range, while the EOP special units had the highest percentage of students scoring above 560. Other significant percentages of students in this range were found at the EOP University Centers and Ag and Techs.

Table 16

Percentile Distribution of RSE Scores,
1971 Series for High School Seniors
Entering College Fall, 1972

Source: Bureau of Higher and Professional Educational Testing, State Education Department

Score Ranges	Percentile Ranges
160+	66-99
140-159	54-66
120-139	41-54
100-119	28-41
80-99	14-28
60-79	3-14
Less than 60	-3

Mean = 138 Median = 133 Positively skewed.

Table 17

Accumulative Distribution of RSE Scores
for EOP Students, 1972-1973

RSE Scores Ranges	University Centers	University Colleges	Special Units	Ag and Techs	State Operated	Community Colleges
160+	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
140 - 160	93.2	93.8	46.6	91.6	92.7	97.3
120 - 140	88.5	85.2	33.3	84.5	85.3	94.1
100 - 120	79.0	65.3	26.6	72.6	69.1	87.6
80 - 100	60.8	46.7	13.3	58.3	51.8	74.4
60 - 80	39.2	24.7	0.0	44.0	30.4	49.3
0 - 60	8.8	5.2	0.0	21.4	7.4	16.2

Table 18
Distribution of SAT Scores, 1972-73*

	1972-73 State Norm	HEOP		Educational Opportunity Program					
		Four Year	Two Year	Univ. Center	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag & Tech	State Oper.	Comm. Colls.
Math									
560+	28.4%	9.5%	0.0%	4.8%	10.1	23.3%	10.9%	9.4%	2.2%
380 - 559	55.7	43.1	51.4	48.8	50.8	70.0	52.2	51.3	34.4
320 - 379	9.5	28.1	31.4	25.3	20.0	6.7	28.3	21.5	36.6
260 - 319	4.3	15.2	14.3	15.7	15.5	0.0	6.5	14.0	22.3
260	2.3	4.1	2.9	5.4	3.6	0.0	2.2	3.8	4.4
Verbal									
560+	18.7	3.7	0.0	1.8	8.6	16.7	10.9	7.2	1.5
380 - 559	57.4	41.2	41.2	38.1	44.0	63.3	43.9	42.7	31.0
320 - 379	13.3	1.2	20.6	26.5	24.8	10.0	21.7	24.3	23.7
260 - 319	6.9	20.0	26.5	24.7	15.9	10.0	19.6	18.4	33.9
260	3.7	4.1	11.8	10.8	6.8	0.0	4.3	7.4	9.9

* SEEK data not available

Table 19 displays the accumulative distribution of combined SAT scores for opportunity students. Most students (80 - 100%) scored below 1,000. No HEOP entrants to the part-time programs scored over 760 (combined).

The SEEK program did not report high school rank, type of diploma, RSE or SAT scores for 1972-73.

Major Subject Area of Study for Opportunity Students, 1972-73[1]

Two-Year: Among the public college students in opportunity programs, public service-related technologies and business and commerce technologies were the most popular fields of study in 1972. Most HEOP students were working toward two-year degrees in the liberal arts and human services (Table 20).

Four-Year: Social sciences and education were the most important subject areas of study among opportunity students and regularly admitted students. Business and management also ranked high for both regular and special program students (Table 21).

Supportive Services

The disparity between the educational tools possessed by the opportunity student and the performance demanded at the college level requires that a major effort in educational support, remediation and development be undertaken. To meet the challenges presented by the inadequate high school preparation of opportunity students, public and private institutions throughout the State have developed comprehensive programs of tutoring, counseling and developmental/supportive/remedial courses.[2]

1. SEEK did not provide this information.

2. Community Colleges generally excluded.

Table 19

Accumulative Distribution of Combined SAT Scores for Opportunity Students, 1972-73*

	HEOP			Educational Opportunity Program					
SAT Combined	Four Year Prog.	Two Year Prog.	Part-Time	Univ. Center	Univ. College	Special Units	Ag & Tech	Mean, State-Operated	Comm. College
Above 1120	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1000-1118	93.4	100.0%		96.3	90.7	80.0	89.2	91.6	98.2
880-998	83.0	94.3		87.3	82.2	58.3	72.9	81.7	94.9
720-878	69.3	82.7		74.4	66.0	30.0	60.9	66.2	84.5
640-758	51.3	53.7	100.0%	54.0	43.3	13.3	41.3	44.7	65.5
520-638	21.7	27.6	34.8%	28.2	20.9	5.0	16.3	21.8	35.3
below 520	4.1	7.3	0.0%	8.1%	5.2%	0.0%	3.3%	5.6%	7.1%

*SEEK data not available

Table 20

Major Subject Area of Study for Opportunity Students Enrolled in Two-Year Degree Programs, 1972-73[1]

Line No.	Major Subject Area	EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM				HEOP
		Special Units	Ag & Techs.	State Operated	Community Colleges	2-Year Programs
1.	Business & Commerce Technologies	19.6%	27.8%	27.0%	34.1%	7.7%
2.	Data Processing Technologies	--	2.4	2.2	2.7	--
3.	Health Services and Paramedical	7.8	12.6	12.1	14.4	--
4.	Mechanical & Engineering Technologies	--	17.4	15.7	7.3	--
5.	Natural Science Technologies	27.5	5.7	7.8	1.0	--
6.	Public Service Related Technologies	39.2	20.9	22.7	17.2	--
7.	Other [2]	5.9	13.3	12.5	23.3	92.3
8.	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

1. SEEK data not available.

2. Includes liberal arts and human services.

Table 21

Rank Order of Major Areas of Study for Upper Division Students in Four or Five-Year Bachelor Degree Programs, 1972-73*

	HEOP		EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM			STATEWIDE for regular students
Rank	4-Yrs	Part-time	Univ. Centers	Univ. Colleges	Special Colleges	
1.	Social Sciences	Education	Social Sciences	Education	Social Sciences	Social Sciences
2.	Education	Public Affairs & Services	No Specific Subject Area	Social Sciences	Agriculture & Natural Resources; Biological Sciences**	Education
3.	Business & Management	Business & Management	Business & Management Ed.; Health Professionals **	No Specific Subject Area		Business & Management
4.	Psychology	Health Professions; Communications**		Fine & Applied Arts	Business Management	Letters
5.	Fine & Applied Arts			Letters	Engineering	Psychology

* SEEK data not available

** Ties

Tutoring is provided to assist students in a non-formal, supportive setting, to help them master basic techniques. Patterns of usage of this service varied widely (Table 22), with the average tutee at a SUNY Ag and Tech receiving 46 hours yearly, and a SEEK student only 9.6. This may reflect the greater availability of other forms of academic support at CUNY. Tutoring tends to be less used as the student moves into the upper levels, although still 20% - 30% of the users are from this group.

Tutoring often appears to be most effective when the tutor is a peer of the tutee; this process has proved effective at many educational levels. Graduates, or professionals (advanced degree holders), are used when the subject matter is highly specialized (Table 23). This is especially true at the SUNY University Centers and specialized units.

Of the various areas in which tutoring was offered, mathematics, language arts and study skills tend to predominate. Students at SEEK did demonstrate a greater need than those in the other sectors for tutoring in non-basic skills areas.

Counseling services are provided to help students in defining and realizing their goals. These services are always available to opportunity program students. The number of contact hours during which students actually saw counselors varied greatly, however, with a range from nearly sixty hours per student per 36-week period at HEOP two-year institutions to 7.9 hours for part-time students (Table 24). The number of students per counselor (caseload) showed great variation, but as counseling personnel were reported by headcount, with many part-time staff involved in the private sector, extrapolations are difficult to draw.

Table 22

Distribution of Tutoring Services to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
		Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs.	State Oper.	Comm. Colls.
Total No. of Tutors	762	1,233	64	111	325	790	108	159	1,382	262
Tutoring hrs.	33,990	87,493	2,896	7,305	16,744	68,628	1,344	9,614	96,330	9,405
Tot.No.Sts. Tutored	3,550	2,129	83	792	758	1,595	56	209	2,618	285
A)Percent Lower Div.	N.A.	76.9%	94.0%	90.2%	68.5%	74.3%	69.6%	97.6%	74.4%	98.9%
B)Percent Upper Div.	N.A.	23.1%	6.0%	9.8%	31.5%	25.7%	30.4%	2.4%	25.6%	1.1%
Avg.No.Hrs. Received	9.6	41.1	34.9	9.2	22.1	43.0	24.0	46.0	36.8	33.0
Percent Tut. Contacts of Tot.Enrolled	39.5%	55.5%	29.5%	63.8%	26.4%	48.9%	9.9%	143.2%	38.3%	12.0%

Table 23

Distribution of Tutoring Services
to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

		HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
Tutoring Services	SEEK	Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs.	All State Oper.	Comm. Colls.
Lang. Arts & Study Skills	22.0%	28.2%	43.8%	27.9%	26.5%	24.4%	2.8%	8.2%	21.4%	20.6%
Math	27.2	22.5	17.2	9.9	31.4	20.1	10.2	39.0	24.2	43.9
Social Science	10.8	13.6	21.9	24.3	18.8	22.8	4.6	17.0	19.7	13.7
Physical Science	9.3	17.1	9.4	5.4	11.4	8.9	13.9	18.9	16.7	10.7
Other	30.7	18.6	7.8	32.4	12.0	13.8	68.5	17.0	18.0	11.1
Total Hours	762	1,233	64	111	325	790	108	159	1,381	262
Level Tutor % Undergraduate	74.7%	73.6%	59.4%	12.6%	56.6%	78.5%	14.8%	88.7%	69.6%	63.7%
% Graduate	21.1	13.1	0.0	50.5	41.5	10.4	80.6	1.3	22.1	4.2
% Professional	3.0	13.4	40.6	36.9	1.8	11.1	4.6	10.1	8.3	32.1
% Paid	98.2	83.0	100.0	95.5	99.7	74.8	33.3	76.1	77.6	53.4
Voluntary	1.8	17.0	0.0	4.5	0.3	25.2	66.7	23.9	22.4	46.6

Table 24

Counseling Services to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP			Educational Opportunity Program					
		Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Centers	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag & Tech.	State Oper.	Comm. Coll.
Total # Couns.*	163	387	25	21	33	61	5	14	113	96
Total # Sts. Served	7,910	3,251	165	1,113	1,102	1,458	366	323	3,349	3,320
Avg. Hours Per Wk. w/Contacts	4,124	2,471	274	250	803	969	94	317	2,181	898
Contact as % Total Enrolled	88.1%	84.7	71.8	89.7	41.9	44.7	64.4	221.2	48.9	139.2%
Hrs. per Student Per 36 Weeks	18.7	27.4	59.8	7.9	24.1	23.8	9.4	35.3	23.4	9.7
Number Sts. per Counselor*	48.5	8.4	6.6	53.0	36.4	23.9	73.2	23.1	32.5	33.5

* Headcount

Counselors perform a variety of functions. Educational counseling was nearly always their primary activity (Table 25), but personal, psychological, financial and vocational counseling were also provided. It is important to note that all of these are services normally thought to be available as a matter of course at collegiate institutions, but which must be specially provided for opportunity program students.

Special coursework. Students in these programs usually take a series of courses, some for no credit (remedial), and others with strong emphases on basic skills, as they move into the regular college curriculum. Courses in the language arts comprised one-third of all such courses taken, and math/sciences one-fourth.

Completion rates ranged from 69% to 93% in such courses. HEOP had the most successful completion rate of all the four-year full-time programs (Table 28).

In sum, the average opportunity program student who availed himself/herself of program services (40% of all students for tutoring, 81% for counseling), received an average of 25 hours of tutoring and 21 hours of counseling (Table 29). If he/she was in a remedial class, the average size was fewer than 8 students, meeting an average of four hours a week for fourteen weeks; the average student received 13 hours of such class time.

Table 25

Rank Order of Counseling Contacts
by Purpose in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
		Four Year.	Two Year.	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units.	Ag. & Techs.	State Oper.	Comm. Colls.
Psychological	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Personal & Social	2	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	3
Educational	1	1	2	1	2.5	1	1	1	1	1
Financial	4	3	4	4	2.5	3	2	4	3	2
Placement-Vocational & Educational	3	4	3	3	5	4	4	3	4	4
Other	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

Table 26

Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses
Utilized by Opportunity Students, 1972-1973

	SEEK	HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
		Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs.	State Oper.	Comm. Colls
Number of Sections	897	628	39	101	149	197	10	110	812	535
Aver. No. of Weeks	15.6	11.8	14.5	14.8	15.2	11.5	12.2	14.3	13.4	14.5
Avg.No.Hrs. per Week	4.1	4.1	3.3	3.4	4.7	3.5	4.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
Total No.Sts. Enrolled 1	7,971	4,495	567	1,333	1,237	2,742	40	449	8,447	1,405
Percent Sts. Completing	78.7	89.0	87.1	68.9	70.9	69.6	92.5	90.9	71.2	73.8

1. Duplicated Headcounts.

Table 27

Percent Distribution of Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses Utilized by Opportunity Students, 1972-1973

Courses	Percent
Study Skills	12.8%
Language Arts	34.7
Reading Skills	17.0
Math-Sciences	24.0
Other	11.4
TOTAL	100.0%

Table 28

Completion Rates, Remedial/Developmental/Supportive Courses, 1972-1973

	SEEK	HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM						
		Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs.	State Oper.	Comm. Colls.	State-wide
% Completing	78.7%	89.0	87.1	68.9	70.9	69.6	92.5	90.9	72.3	73.8	78.8

Table 29

Summary,
Supportive Services Available to Opportunity Students in 1972-73

Tutoring		Counseling		Special Courses	
Number of student contacts	9,457	Number of counseling contacts	19,108	Number of classroom contacts	20,239
Number tutors	3,813	Number counselors[1]	808	Number sections	2,666
No. sts. per tutor	2.5	No. sts. per coun.	23.7	No. sts. per sec.	7.6
Avg. hrs. tutoring received	25.1	Avg. hrs. counseling received[2]	21.2	Avg. hrs. class rec'd.	12.8
Contacts as % of total enr.	40.1	Contacts as % total enrollment	81.1	Avg. contact weeks	14.1
Total enr. per tutor	6.2	Total enr. per couns.	29.3	Avg. hrs. contact wk.	4.0

1. Headcount.

2. I.e., the average student counselled received 21.2 hours.

Academic Progress of Opportunity Students, 1972-73

Two standard measures of student achievement are grade point average and rate of credit accumulation. A third measure, rate of retention/attrition, has been examined earlier.

The percent distribution of grade point averages, based on a 4.0 scale, is exhibited in Table 30. Of four-year programs, opportunity students at the university centers demonstrated the most favorable overall distribution of GPA by having the least number of students under 0.9 and the most students over 2.4. The distributions of the two-year programs varied so that no one program exhibited an outstanding distribution.

Opportunity students are expected to accumulate an average of at least 12 semester hours per term. Based on a time-lengthened degree program, it would normally take an opportunity student ten semesters to graduate in a regular four-year program and six semesters in a regular two-year program.

Table 31 displays the average number of credits accumulated by those students in each semester of attendance category. The relatively low number at the eighth semester in SEEK (813) may represent the lack of a policy at most CUNY campuses in that year on maximum length of tenure or entitlement in a SEEK program.

Table 32 measures student credit accumulation against minimum "expected performance," i.e., accumulating credits at a rate sufficient to graduate in three years from a two-year, or five years from a four-year, institution. By the fifth semester of bachelor's degree programs, most students in the public institutions were below the minimally expected

Table 30

Accumulative GPA's for Opportunity Students in Attendance, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP			EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM					
GPA Range		Four Year	Two Year	Part-Time	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs	State Oper.	Comm. Colls.
0.0 - 0.8	8.1%	5.5%	14.1%	17.7%	7.9%	6.6%	5.7%	10.1%	7.3%	15.5%
0.9 - 1.6	15.2	13.1	8.3	3.2	8.1	15.2	18.0	26.4	14.0	15.2
1.7 - 2.4	39.1	42.3	46.8	18.2	27.8	47.3	48.4	38.1	40.2	36.4
2.5 - 3.2	29.7	33.2	27.6	36.9	41.8	28.0	24.6	20.4	31.7	24.3
3.3 - 4.0	7.8	5.9	3.2	24.0	14.5	3.0	3.3	4.6	6.8	8.7

Table 21

Average Credits Accumulated by Number of Semesters in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP		EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM			
		Four Year	Two Year	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Ag. & Techs.	Comm. Colls.
No. Semesters in Program							
1	5.5	8.4	7.4	8.1	6.9	15.2	6.9
2	15.2	21.1	19.4	18.6	21.8	19.1	20.2
3	23.8	32.2	35.6	27.5	29.1	41.9	27.8
4	36.4	48.5	53.5	44.7	45.0	56.3	44.9
5	45.4	64.3	60.0	61.2	55.1	50.2	45.7
6	57.5	79.8	64.0	75.4	74.3	57.1	55.6
7	71.0	91.4		98.0	85.5		54.5
8	81.3	106.1		104.5	106.8		60.1
9	88.7	89.8		102.6	100.8		63.9
10	97.2	106.3		98.0	101.5		

Table 32

Distribution of Opportunity Students by Total Hours Accumulated by 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP		EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS				
Credit Accumulation		Four Year	Two Year	Univ. Cntr.	Univ. Colls.	Special Units	Ag. & Techs.	Comm. Colls.
Percent below minimal performance	46.9%	22.3%	13.1%	35.1%	26.8%	13.3%	10.5%	35.4%
Percent: Minimal expected performance	49.3	57.9	55.1	52.0	59.6	63.3	58.4	53.6
Percent: Beyond Minimal Expected Performance	3.8	19.8	31.8	12.9	13.6	23.4	31.1	11.0
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Percent sts. "on track"	53.1%	77.7%	86.9%	64.9%	73.2%	86.7%	89.5%	64.0%

credit accumulation (60 credits). At the eighth semester, when regular students were expected to graduate, all these programs, except SEEK, surpassed their expected credit accumulation (96 credits).

The community colleges and the ag and techs also were below the expected ranges while HEOP two-year programs met or exceeded them. The percent of students "on track," then, fluctuated according to the average rate of credits accumulated. Overall, SEEK demonstrated the lowest percent of students in baccalaureate programs "on track," while HEOP had the most. The community colleges had fewer than two-thirds of their opportunity students meeting the expected rate of credit accumulation.

College-Going Costs and Financial Aid for Opportunity Students 1972-73

In 1972-73, opportunity students came from families which had such limited resources to devote to education that college access would have been virtually denied if it had not been for opportunity programs.

Average college-going costs are derived from data submitted by the various institutions participating in opportunity programs. In 1972-73, financial aid personnel reported between $2,150 and $4,000 in annual expenses for opportunity students enrolled in bachelor's degree programs, and $1,700 to $2,700 for students enrolled in associate degree programs (Table 33).

Because financial assistance for disadvantaged students has never been sufficient to offset all the college-going costs (Table 33), a student's budget can be examined in terms of those priority costs which must be met so that a person can satisfy the institution's minimum demands.

Table 33

Average Costs[1] Compared to Average Aid[2] Available to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP Four Year	EOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Ag & Techs.	EOP Comm. Colls.
Total Avg. aid	N.A.	$3,744	$2,132	$1,690	$1,985	$1,899
Total Avg. Budget[3]	2,154	3,988	2,525[4]	2,680	2,625	1,644
Difference: Unmet Need	N.A.	$ -244	$ -395	$ -990	$- 640	$+ 253

1. Educational and maintenance costs to the student as reflected in typical student budgets submitted by institutions.

2. Including grants, work and loans.

3. Dependent resident and commuter students only.

4. Add $150 for upper division student budgets.

These are tuition, fees, and books. Living costs, unfortunately, sometimes assume a secondary importance in institutional financial aid packaging, so that the deficit between aid and cost is made to fall directly upon the student. Tables 34 and 35 demonstrate the ratio of educational costs to living costs for each group. The highest educational costs (65% of the total) are represented at HEOP, with high tuition, while living costs are 88% of the total at SEEK, with no tuition charge.

Grants in aid to program students are not sufficient to provide adequate funds for living expenses, once educational costs have been deducted (Tables 36 and 37).

Table 36 shows that in every case grant funds were insufficient to cover educational and living costs for program students; loans and work were necessary to make up the difference, as shown in Table 37. While community college students' costs appear to be nearly met by grant funds, this figure results from an apparent failure to factor in the sizable numbers of married students (25% - Table 14) involved, whose costs are much higher. This also suggests that the actual gap experienced by students at HEOP two-year institutions is even higher than the $1,329 displayed in Table 36.

In terms of the sources of financial aid, the net financial aid contribution made by the combined resources of the State of New York were greater than either federal or institutional resources, due largely to opportunity program grants. SEEK and four-year SUNY students received the largest opportunity grants, while HEOP two-year students received the least financial aid from this source (Table 38).

Table 34

Percent Distribution of Budgeted College-Going Costs for Opportunity Students, 1972-73

Percent Dist.	Baccalaureate Degree Programs			Associate Degree Programs		
	SEEK	HEOP Four Year	EOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Ag & Techs	EOP Community Colleges
Educ. Costs	12.2%	64.8	37.6[1]	54.0	37.2	40.9
Living Costs	87.8%	35.2	62.4	46.0	62.8	59.1

Table 35

Distribution of Budgeted College-Going Costs for Opportunity Students, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP Four Year	EOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Ag & Techs	EOP Comm. Colleges
Educational Costs	$ 263	$ 2,548	$ 949[2]	$1,447	$ 977	$ 672
Living Costs	1,891	1,404	1,576	1,233	1,648	972

[1] For lower division students.

[2] Add $150 for upper division students.

Table 36

Financial Aid Grants to Opportunity Students
Compared to Budgeted Costs, 1972-73

	SEEK	HEOP Four Year	EOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Ag & Tech	EOP Comm. Colleges
Total Average Grants in Aid	$ 1,203[1]	$ 3,038	$ 1,744	$ 1,351	$ 1,689	$ 1,635
Less Educational Costs	263	2,584	949	1,447	977	672
Remainder for Living Costs	940	454	795	-96	712	963[2]
Less Living Costs	1,891	1,404	1,576	1,233	1,648	972
Remainder: Unmet Need	-951	-950	-781	-1,329	-936	-9

[1]Data incomplete for SEEK.

[2]Not altogether accurate since married student costs are not factored in.

Table 37

Distribution of Average Aid per Student in Opportunity Programs, 1972-73

State Aid	SEEK[1]	HEOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Univ. Center Colls.	EOP Ag. & Techs.	EOP Comm. College
Average Opportunity Grant	$1,070	$ 969	$ 678	$1,063	$ 949	$996
SI-RCS	NA	413	327	277	308	442
NYHEAC Loans	NA	95	84	32	17	55
Subtotal State Aid	NA	1,477	1,089	1,372	1,274	1,493
Institutional Aid:						
Grants/Waivers[2]	NA	1,174	296	163	206	77
Loans	NA	17	0	12	21	20
Work	NA	15	11	16	16	8
Subtotal Institutional Aid	NA	1,206	307	191	243	105
Federal Aid:						
EOG	133	482	50	241	226	120
NDSL	56	149	88	259	132	74
CWSP	106	110	96	51	75	103
Subtotal Federal	295	941	234	551	443	297
Other	NA	120	60	18	35	4
Total Average Aid	NA	3,744	1,690	2,132	1,985	1,899

[1] Data for SEEK incomplete.

[2] Data on SUNY grants and tuition waivers incomplete.

Table 38

Percent Distribution of Financial Aid to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

Percent Distribution	HEOP Four-Year	EOP Four-Year	HEOP Two-Year	EOP Ag & Techs.	EOP Community Colleges
State Funds:					
Opportunity Grant	25.9 %	49.4%	40.1%	47.8%	52.4%
SI-RCS	11.0	13.0	19.3	15.5	23.3
NY HEAC - Loans	2.5	1.5	5.0	0.9	2.9
Subtotal State Funds	39.4%	64.4%	64.4%	64.2%	78.6%
Institution:					
Grants/Waivers	31.4	7.6	17.5	10.4	4.1
Loans	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.1	1.1
Work	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.4
Subtotal Institutional	32.2%	9.0%	18.2%	12.2	5.5%
Federal:					
EOG	12.9	11.3	3.0	11.4	6.3
NDSL	9.3	12.1	5.2	6.6	3.9
CWSP	2.9	2.4	5.7	3.8	5.4
Subtotal Federal	25.1%	25.8%	13.8%	22.3%	15.6%
Other	3.2%	0.8%	3.6%	1.8%	0.2%

Grants and waivers among the private institutions differed greatly, with the senior institutions providing four times as much aid as two-year institutions. While these institutional funds were from private resources, institutional funds committed by CUNY and SUNY were from public funds appropriated to the colleges through their regular operating budgets. Therefore, the amount of State/public aid to SUNY and CUNY students was even more substantial than indicated.

The average EOG[1] awards are sometimes read as an indicator of the levels of commitment by participating institutions to opportunity students. Private four-year colleges and universities provided their students with the most EOG money. However, low EOG grants to program students might also indicate sizable numbers of non-program disadvantaged students at a campus. The more expensive private institutions also provided students with higher NDSL loans. HEOP four-year students, on the average, worked more than other students.[2] Furthermore, federal sources of financial aid totaled the most at institutions where costs were the greatest.

Private college grants by four-year institutions to opportunity students averaged 21.2% more than the special opportunity grants. In all, the amounts of institutional funds were almost equal to all the financial aid resources of the State, which represented under 40% of the total available aid (Table 38). In other programs, state resources, as a percent of total aid, averaged up to twice that in private four-year colleges.

(SEEK did not provide the information necessary for the above analyses.)

---

1. E O (now SEOG) is federal money awarded discretionarily by the institution to needy students.

2. In the College Work-Study Program (CWSP).

Table 39

Percent Distribution of Financial Aid
to Opportunity Students, 1972-73

Percent Distribution	HEOP Four Year	EOP Four Year	HEOP Two Year	EOP Ag & Techs.	EOP Comm. Colls.
Grants	84.4%	82.6%	83.5%	86.9%	86.3%
Loans	12.3	14.2	10.2	8.6	7.9
Work	3.3	3.2	6.4	4.6	5.8

Apparently, the availability of federal work, loan and grant resources enabled opportunity students to attend the higher-cost private institutions. Work sources can not be as readily used by opportunity students as by others, as work takes away from study time which the academically disadvantaged student needs, especially in the first years. This helps to account for the relatively moderate amounts engendered through this source.

Opportunity Programs Expenditures, 1972-73

For regular college students, college-going budgets were similar to those of opportunity students in terms of costs to the student. However, opportunity students were provided with essential supportive services (Table 29) to insure a successful college experience. The costs of these services were incurred in addition to regular college-going costs. The extent of these costs and the services they represent will be examined here.

Professional services were supplied by numerous administrators, counselors and teachers who worked within the opportunity programs to provide necessary supportive services. Table 40 shows that the ratio of students to special program personnel ranged from 9:1 at SEEK to 73:1 at the SUNY four-year campuses. However, numerous persons in "regular" SUNY lines devote professional time to program students. There appears to be no correlation between services to students, measured in caseload, and expenditures; while HEOP two-year units had the lowest per-student expenditure for support services ($160), the student/ staff ratio is below average at 25:1.

Table 40

Professional Personnel Caseload of Opportunity Students and Average Supportive Services Expenditures per Student, 1973

	Total Professional Staff	Caseload[1]	Expenditures[2]
SEEK	1,009.5	8.9	$ 1,139
HEOP Four-Year	204.5	18.5	1,062
EOP Four-Year	84	73	479
Average Four-Year	--	14.6	910
HEOP Two-Year	11.3	24.9	160
Part-Time	30.2	41.1	203
EOP Special Units	5.2	28.1	568
Ag. & Techs	19.0	29.9	350
Community Colls	59.7	40.0	428
Average Two-Yr./ Other	--	36.8	346

1. Ratio of students to personnel on special program lines (headcount only).
2. Per student in supportive services.

Table 41 summarizes those program expenditures incurred by each program on behalf of opportunity students. As in Table 36, financial aid for educational expenses fluctuated according to tuition costs, so that all the grant financial aid received by students at two-year private colleges went toward tuition, books and fees.

Table 41

Total Opportunity Program Expenditures Per Student:
Supportive Service Costs plus Tuition, Fees and Books
plus Living Costs (from all sources)

	Supp. Serv.	Ed. Costs	Sub Total Educational Expenditures	Maintenance[2]	Total Exp. Per Student
SEEK[1]	$1,139	$ 263	$1,402	$1,102	$ 2,504
HEOP: Four-Year	1,062	2,584	3,646	1,160	4,806
EOP: Four-Year	479	949	1,428	1,183	2,611
HEOP: Two-Year	160	1,447	1,607	243	1,650
EOP: Ag & Techs	350	977	1,327	1,008	2,335
EOP: Comm. Colls.	428	672	1,110	1,227	2,327

[1] Data incomplete for SEEK.

[2] As awarded in financial aid. Living cost does not reflect actual student need, only actual awards.

Private four-year institutions expended the greatest amount of dollars per opportunity student, and the two-year colleges, the least. Despite the lack of tuition at CUNY, the SEEK programs expended as much as, or more than, the other public sector programs. Unfortunately, SEEK did not supply all necessary financial aid data to make totally satisfactory comparisons.

Comments and Recommendations

While the lateness of submittal of the reports covered in this analysis renders somewhat moot any specific recommendation, some general observations are in order. More detailed recommendations will accompany our analysis of 1973-74 reports.

1. In all sectors, opportunity programs accounted for a small percentage (from four to ten percent) of the total student enrollment. However, they did amount to a large percentage (40% to 60%) of the non-white enrollment at participating institutions, indicating their value as a vehicle to enhance the goal of equality of educational opportunity. Any diminution in the opportunity student enrollment would affect the total number of minority students already on campus.

2. It is interesting to note that the highest ranking job placement for opportunity students was in the field of education. This is particularly significant in light of the tightening of the job market in that field but appears to indicate that minority group members are in demand in this profession. The influx of opportunity program students has helped to diversify and enrich the education profession itself.

3. About 25% of opportunity program students who graduated in 1972-73 went into graduate and professional schools. It is an interesting American phenomenon that such large numbers of first-generation college graduates pursued further professional or graduate education. This development could be attributed to the high level of aspiration, confidence, achievement and sophistication on the part of those students and those who counselled them.

4. Certain practices lack consistency as examined across the three sectors. It is to be hoped that in the continuing evaluation of these programs, the "coordinated policy" envisioned by the legislation emerges. For example:

(a) While the sectors have now agreed on a common income scale for defining economic "disadvantage," a clear understanding of educational "disadvantage" is still lacking. For instance, 61% of EOP admits at University Centers had RSE scores below 100, while only 13% of EOP admits at the SUNY specialized units fall in this category.

(b) While HEOP and EOP both assume a limited number of semesters of eligibility to achieve a degree goal, such as ten semesters for a normal four-year baccalaureate, SEEK imposes no such expectation. Thus at the end of eight full semesters, the average SEEK student had completed 81 credits, the average EOP/HEOP student 106.

(c) A rational State policy of financial aid for students in opportunity programs clearly does not exist. The students are the same in their sociological, educational and economic circumstances. As such they have similar needs in terms of availability for work during term time, and limits in term of family resources and ability to take on high loans. Yet the match between need and aid varies from program to program, all the way from no unmet need at the upstate community colleges to a $950 shortfall at SEEK and above $1,300 at the private two-year colleges.

5. The public sector central administrations should take care to devote the resources necessary for the timely and accurate accounting of program activities and expenditures, as the law provides. Only thus can the coordination and improvement of program practices for the disadvantaged in higher education be fully accomplished.

6. The poor performance of EOP students at community colleges can be directly traced to lack of comprehensive supportive services. Every effort must be made to remedy this situation.

Appendix A

Institutions Participating in New York State Opportunity Programs, 1972-1973

A. City University of New York

Bernard M. Baruch College
Brooklyn College
City College
Medgar Evers College
Hunter College
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Herbert H. Lehman College
Queens College
University Center
York College
Richmond College

B. Private Colleges and Universities

I. Four-Year Programs

Bard College
Canisius College
College of Mt. St. Vincent
College of New Rochelle
College of St. Rose
Colgate University
Barnard College
Columbia College
Columbia University-General Studies
Cornell University
C.W. Post College
Dowling College
Elmira College
Fordham University
Hamilton-Kirkland Colleges
Hobart/Wm. Smith College
Hofstra University
Iona College
Ithaca College
Keuka College
LeMoyne College
Long Island University
Manhattan College
Manhattanville College
Marist College
Marymount-Manhattan College
Marymount-Tarrytown College
Mercy College
Mt. St. Mary College
Nazareth College
New York Inst. of Tech. (Old Westbury)
New York Inst. of Tech. (New York)
New York University
Niagara University
Pace University, New York City
Pace University, Westchester
Polytechnic Inst. - Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.
Rochester Inst. of Technology
Rosary Hill College
Russell Sage College
St. John Fisher College
St. John's University
St. Lawrence University
Siena College
Skidmore College
Syracuse University
Union College
University of Rochester
Utica College
Vassar College
Wagner College

II. Two-Year Programs

College for Human Services
Elizabeth Seton College
Harriman College
Junior College of Albany
Mater Dei College

III. Part-Time Programs

Malcolm King-Harlem Extension
New York Inst. of Tech., Old Westbury
University College of Syracuse University

IV. Consortia

Associated Colleges of Mid-Hudson Area
Community Leadership Consortium
Academic Opportunity Consortium

C. State University of New York

I. State Operated Universities and Colleges

a) Four Year Institutions

1. University Centers

Albany
Binghamton
Buffalo
Stonybrook

2. University Colleges

Brockport
Buffalo
Cortland
Fredonia
Geneseo
Mt. Vernon
New Paltz
Old Westbury
Oneonta
Oswego
Plattsburgh
Potsdam
Purchase

b) Special Units

College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Maritime College
Statutory Colleges at Cornell
Upstate Medical Center

c) Agricultural and Technical Colleges

Alfred
Canton
Cobleskill
Farmingdale
Morrisville

II. Community Colleges

Broome
Clinton
Finger Lakes
Corning
Erie, City Campus
Erie, North Campus
Fashion Institute of Technology
Fulton-Montgomery
Genesee
Herkimer
Hudson Valley
Jamestown
Mohawk Valley
Monroe
Nassau
Niagara
Onondaga
Rockland
Schenectady County
Suffolk County
Sullivan County
Ulster County
Westchester